

THE DUMBARTON OAKS PSALTER AND NEW TESTAMENT. THE ICONOGRAPHY OF THE MOSCOW LEAF

ANTHONY CUTLER

When Sirarpie Der Nersessian published Dumbarton Oaks codex 3,¹ the former Mount Athos, Pantokrator codex 49, she noted the absence from the manuscript of seven leaves. Two of these she could describe since they had been acquired by the Benaki Museum in Athens² and by the Cleveland Museum of Art.³ Four of the remaining five, though missing, were known through photographs at the Ecole des Hautes Etudes and Dumbarton Oaks⁴ or through reproductions or descriptions by earlier commentators on the manuscript.⁵ But the remaining leaf, predicated by Der Nersessian on the basis of a lacuna in the text as folio 187 bis, remained unaccounted for until a detached page in the Tretjakov Gallery was associated with our Psalter and New Testament.⁶

In fact, this page had been known long before V. G. Putsko identified it with our book, the Easter tables of which provide for the years 1084–1101. It came to the Gallery in Moscow on 9 December 1930 from the Zagorsk Museum where it was kept after its presentation in 1919 to the Trinity-Sergius

monastery by V. I. Grigorovič.⁷ We know that Grigorovič spent three days at the Pantokrator Monastery on the Holy Mountain in October 1844;⁸ when Brockhaus studied the manuscript in 1890 the leaf had disappeared.⁹ Of its relationship to the Psalter and New Testament there can be no doubt. The size of the page and the script of both the gold, semi-uncial titulus¹⁰ and the regular brown minuscule below it (fig. 1)¹¹ are those of the main body of the book.¹² The text on the verso of the page (fig. 2) ends precisely at that point in the middle of John 1:26 where folio 188 picks up.¹³ The decora-

⁷This invalidates the claim by S. Gardner in *Illuminated Greek Manuscripts* (note 3 *supra*), 100, that “when K. Weitzmann studied the manuscript on Mount Athos in 1932, it was still intact save for folio 78.”

⁸B. Fonkič, “Grečeskie rukopisi Odessy,” *VizVrem*, 39 (1978), 189. The verso of the leaf (fig. 2), heretofore unpublished, bears in the left margin a pre-Revolutionary inscription in pencil identifying it as a gift “from B. Grigorovič.” Even while in Zagorsk, the recto of the page (fig. 1) was published by N. P. Lihačev, *Materialy dlja istorii russkogo ikonopisannja*, II (St. Petersburg, 1906), no. 697. The miniature was dated in the fourteenth century by N. V. Rozanov (*Voprosy russkogo i sovetskogo iskusstva*, 1 [1971], 48.) The literature on the leaf to date is completed by K. Treu, *Die griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments in der UdSSR* (Berlin, 1966), 360, and O. S. Popova, “Grečeskoe evangelie vtoroj poloviny XI veka, Miniatury i ornament,” *Zbornik za likovne umetnosti*, 15 (1979), 39–40, 46–47, figs. 9, 10.

⁹Note 5 *supra*.

¹⁰The title of John’s Gospel is badly rubbed, probably as a result of being exposed at the base of the square formed by a horizontal fold at the midsection of the leaf. The page has been folded on all sides of the miniature, perhaps to display the picture of Christ as an “icon.”

¹¹I am grateful to Dr. G. I. Vzdornov of Moscow for procuring the photographs for figs. 1, 2, 5, and 12, as well as for other help in the preparation of this study.

¹²For a current description of the manuscript and the literature on it to 1980, see A. Cutler, *The Aristocratic Psalter in Byzantium* (= *Bibliothèque des Cahiers Archéologiques*, XIII [Paris, 1983]), no. 51.

¹³Der Nersessian (“Psalter and New Testament,” 156) noted that the modern pagination of the manuscript does not take

¹“A Psalter and New Testament Manuscript at Dumbarton Oaks,” *DOP*, 19 (1965), 153–83.

²*Ibid.*, 159, figs. 17, 18; *Guide to the Benaki Museum* (Athens, 1936), no. 6.

³*Illuminated Greek Manuscripts from American Collections*, ed. G. Vikan (Princeton, 1973), no. 21, fig. 36.

⁴Der Nersessian, “Psalter and New Testament,” notes 6, 7, 10–12, figs. 1, 2, 26, 27, 31.

⁵H. Brockhaus, *Die Kunst in den Athos-Klöstern* (Leipzig, 1891), 170, 174–75, 205–6; S. Lampros, *Catalogue of the Greek Manuscripts on Mount Athos*, I (Cambridge, Mass., 1895), 98; J. J. Tikkanen, “Die Psalterillustration im Mittelalter,” *Acta Societatis Scientiarum Fennicae*, 21, no. 5 (1903), 128–32; F. Dölger, *Mönchsland Athos* (Munich, 1943), 178–81; K. Weitzmann, *Aus den Bibliotheken des Athos* (Hamburg, 1963), 37–39.

⁶*Iskusstvo vizantii v sobranijah SSSR. Katalog vystavki* (Moscow, 1977), II, no. 496. This entry fails to credit the identification of the leaf (Tretjakov inv. no. 2580) to V. G. Putsko: cf. *Byzantinoslavica*, 40 (1979), 66.

tion, likewise, matches that of Dumbarton Oaks cod. 3. The triangulated blue border, resembling a course of tiles, conforms to one of the two main depictions from the red-on-gold rope-work that normally surrounds miniatures in this book. Set between red frames, it appears first about the portrait of the seated David (fol. 6^r) and then recurs repeatedly, notably in the headpieces to Matthew and Mark (fols. 95^r and 129^r).¹⁴ The second variant, a continuous rinceau border, frames eight miniatures, including that of Christ in the headpiece of Psalm 77 (fig. 3).¹⁵ While the head of this version of the Lord is surrounded by a simple red crossnimbus, the halo of the Christ on the Moscow leaf is a double line, black within red, a unique phenomenon in this manuscript.¹⁶

The differences between these two images of Christ will concern us greatly below, but, for now, the pictorial similarities between the bust on the page in the Tretjakov and other miniatures in the manuscript must be stressed. The manner in which Christ's ochre himation is heightened with blue-black shadows can only with difficulty be related to the treatment of the same garment on the page still in Washington since this tunic, like Christ's hand before it, is largely abraded. But the modeling of his blue mantle and blue-black hair correspond in technique, though not in palette, to the treatment of the Lord in the headpiece to Psalm 77. Generally, the hues employed and the means of tonal gradation applied to them are to be found in the best-preserved miniatures¹⁷ in the Psalter and New Testament, and in particular in the portraits of the

Evangelists and the authors of the Epistles.

The survival of the headpiece to John is to be celebrated because it is one of the few miniatures from Pantokrator cod. 49 in nearly pristine condition. It is no less welcome in that this very fact enables us to study in detail aspects of the iconography of Christ in the second half of the eleventh century, a period characterized both by considerable inventiveness in this area¹⁸ and particularly by the appropriation in book illumination of themes first worked out in icon painting.¹⁹ The alert, powerful figure of the Moscow leaf makes it the most expressive miniature in the Psalter and New Testament; this and the other frontal image of Christ on folio 39^r (fig. 3) are the most icon-like of its pictures.²⁰ In this light the differences between the two miniatures are worth pursuing since it is *a priori* unlikely that they were introduced merely for the sake of variety.

If this be accepted, one is immediately confronted by a problem in terminology. The Christ of the Moscow leaf has repeatedly been identified as a Pantokrator.²¹ Yet the same epithet has been employed for the image on folio 39^r (fig. 3) by Der Nersessian and almost every other commentator on the manuscript, despite the fact that neither miniature includes such a designation. Both depart from the several types of Christ, normally in the main dome of a church, that are usually accorded this title.²² Of the two miniatures, there is no doubt that the Christ above Psalm 77 agrees more nearly both with the type generally understood as the Pantokrator, as well as with the oldest surviving objects—a mid-twelfth century seal now at Dumbarton Oaks and a twelfth- or thirteenth-century rock crystal amulet in Athens²³—that carry this epithet. Along with numerous other variations, the Pantokrator's book may be open or closed, his right hand may cover it or merely support it from below, the fingers of his left hand may point to the book or be raised in blessing. But no image of Christ that can justifiably be called a Pantokrator exhibits

into account "a missing leaf between folios 187 and 188." This obviously suggests that this numeration was done after the removal of our page. The leaf bearing the preface and index to John's Gospel and the image of the Evangelist and Prochoros is, as she observed, also missing. Fol. 186 is now bound into the preceding quire (fols. 182–186). But, as Professor Annemarie Weyl Carr has pointed out to me, it does not necessarily follow that this was the pristine system, since the normal gatherings in D.O. cod. 3 consist of eight leaves. Given that we now know that *two* leaves are missing after fol. 186, this quire could originally have been a bifolio which included both the Evangelist portrait and our Christ page. Equally possibly, a bifolio could have been wrapped around a single leaf bearing the portraits of John and Prochoros.

¹⁴Der Nersessian, "Psalter and New Testament," figs. 28, 29. See also figs. 5 (David writing the Psalms) and 38 (headpiece to epistle of John).

¹⁵*Ibid.*, fig. 7. See also figs. 6, 30, 32, 33, 35, 41, 42.

¹⁶Another unique feature, obviously undistinguishable in the photograph (fig. 1), is the strong red pigment used to heighten the cheeks, the tip of the nose, the lips, and even the forehead.

¹⁷Fols. 73^r, 80^v, 250^r, 261^r (Der Nersessian, "Psalter and New Testament," figs. 10, 22, 33, 38. Cf. the color frontispiece to her article where the blues and reds are too intense but where the technique of tonal gradation is apparent, particularly in the angel's pallium).

¹⁸See most recently the studies by H. Belting and A. Cutler in *DOP*, 34–35 (1980–81).

¹⁹K. Weitzmann, "Byzantine Miniature and Icon Painting in the Eleventh Century," *Proceedings of the XIIIth International Congress of Byzantine Studies, Oxford, 5–10 September 1966* (London, 1967), 205 ff.

²⁰A case can similarly be made for the missing image of the half-length Virgin between the Prodomos and an archangel set above three frontally disposed Fathers of the Church (fol. 4^v, Der Nersessian, "Psalter and New Testament," 167, fig. 2).

²¹*Iskusstvo vizantii* (note 6 *supra*), no. 469; Popova, "Grečeskoe evangelie" (note 8 *supra*), 40.

²²On this problem, see J. T. Matthews, "The Byzantine Use of the Title Pantocrator," *OCP*, 44 (1978), 442–62.

²³*Ibid.*, 445–47, nos. 1, 3, pl. 1.

the features that clearly differentiate the type on the Moscow leaf from that on the page still in Washington. Among these must be counted the form of Christ's eyes and the forelock of his hair, both clearly directed to his right, and the absence of any book or scroll.²⁴

Now the difference in size of the two images of Christ and the greater portion of the Lord shown in the headpiece to Psalm 77 allow the possibility that the Gospel book is intended to be understood as below the frame of the Moscow miniature. Indeed, as we shall see, the model employed probably possessed such an attribute. But the direction of the Lord's irises and forelock to the spectator's left, set in a head that turns to the spectator's right,²⁵ is unambiguous. The question arises therefore whether this is a distinct version of Christ or merely an extreme point along the curve that links the varieties of the Pantokrator type. The bust carries no identification beyond the sigla IC XC, the same abbreviations as flank the nimbus of the Washington Christ. Notwithstanding this laconic designation, the Christ of Psalm 77 has, as we have seen, generally been accepted as a Pantokrator. Should a more precise designation be attached to the image in Moscow?

This question was answered, at least implicitly, by Kurt Weitzmann who, a quarter of a century ago, identified a small icon at Mount Sinai (fig. 4) as that of the Christ Evergetês.²⁶ He assigned this panel to the thirteenth century and clearly distinguished it from the Pantokrator type. While this image, like the Moscow leaf, bears no identification beyond the customary sigla, the icon and the miniature are evidently closely related. In addition to an identical disposition of both the forelock and the eyes,²⁷ the two images show the same short, woolly beard, divided in two parts at the chin, rising over the cheeks and receding to a point where it disappears behind the hair which—in contrast to that of the Pantokrator in Dumbarton Oaks cod. 3—falls mainly on Christ's right shoulder. In the Sinai icon, the Lord's body is cut off at a lower level than on the page in Moscow. There is thus space for the painter to show a closed book supported by

Christ's left hand. The tips of the upheld fingers of the right hand are aligned with the top of the book, the attribute lacking in our miniature. Yet, to the extent that they are visible in the miniature, the forefinger and middle finger make the same blessing gesture. It is this gesture that, for Weitzmann, is the salient characteristic of the Evergetês (the Benefactor).

Weitzmann offered no evidence to support his identification of the type. Yet two of the only three known representations of Christ to carry this epithet confirm his supposition. The obverse of a seal which entered the Hermitage Museum from the Schlumberger collection (fig. 5)²⁸ shows a standing figure of Christ supporting the Gospel book on his left arm and blessing with his right hand. The fingers of the right hand are extended almost to the tip of the beard; much higher, that is, than on the miniature in Moscow but emphasizing the gap between the right hand and the left that may be hypothesized as "below" the frame of our picture. Flanking the figure of the Lord is the legend IC XC O EYEPΓHTHC. Although debate exists as to the precise activities of its owner²⁹—a point to which we shall return—this seal is to be dated between 1092 and 1118 and is certainly the earliest object to attest to the attachment of the epithet Evergetês to Christ; it is also the only Constantinopolitan specimen of the genre. But the next example, although created far from the Byzantine capital, occurs in a context that, in addition to a Christ Evergetês, has other close iconographical associations with Constantinople. Most notable of these is an image of Christ Chalkitês in the narthex of the same church.³⁰ In the tomb-chapel at Bojana, decorated as an inscription suggests for the sebastokrator Ka-

²⁸ *Iskusstvo vizantii* (note 6 *supra*), II, no. 751. This description of the seal, now no. M-6820 in the Hermitage and in very poor condition, errs in reading the dignity of its owner, a certain John Comnenus, as protostrator and megas domestikos. As correctly transcribed by Schlumberger (*Sigillographie de l'empire byzantin* [Paris, 1884], 16–17), the reverse identifies John as protosebastos and megas domestikos.

²⁹ B. Aran, "The Church of Saint Theodosia and the Monastery of Christ Euergetes," *JÖB*, 28 (1979), 216–19, showed that in all probability this John Comnenus (out of seven possible candidates) was the son of the sebastokrator Isaac, brother of Alexius I, and "rebuilt the Monastery of (Christ) Euergetes . . . sometime between 1104 and 1118 when he was probably protosebastos and megas domestikos." P. Gautier (*REB*, 29 [1971], 221, note 7) suggested that this John was also doux of Dyrrachion from 1092 until at least August 1096. A. Janin, *La géographie ecclésiastique de l'empire byzantin*, I, 3: *Les églises et les monastères* (Paris, 1955), 522–24, accepted the view derived from N. Beès and J. Pargoire that this John Comnenus was the nephew of the Emperor John II Comnenus and died at Myriokephalon in 1176.

³⁰ A. Grabar, *La peinture religieuse en Bulgarie* (Paris, 1928), 122–23.

²⁴ The Moscow leaf is flaked in the lower right-hand corner where one would normally expect such an attribute. But neither is there any underdrawing—of the sort that enables us to restore some of the details of fol. 39^r (fig. 3)—to suggest such an object.

²⁵ In this respect the Christ of the Moscow leaf is the mirror-image of that on the page in Washington.

²⁶ "Icon Painting in the Crusader Kingdom," *DOP*, 20 (1966), 77, fig. 59.

²⁷ These are turned toward a pendant icon of the Virgin, *ibid.*, fig. 58.

lojan in 1259, the Evergetês is painted on the west face of the northeast pier of the naos (fig. 6)³¹ on axis with the templon. This frescoed icon shows the Lord seated on a backless throne, his right hand raised in blessing in a manner identical to that vestigially represented on the Moscow leaf. Below the level of the upraised fingers, Christ holds a closed book in his left hand.

Long ago, André Grabar related this image to the seal from the Schlumberger collection and specifically to the monastery of Christ Evergetês in Constantinople and the reputation that this house enjoyed among travelers from Slavic lands.³² An association with the Christ on the Tretjakov page and the Sinai icon (fig. 4) is no less demonstrable when the physiognomies of these figures are compared. In particular, the Christ at Bojana shares the double strand of hair over the forehead of the Moscow leaf and the iris of at least his left eye is again oriented to the spectator's left (fig. 7). While features such as the drooping moustache and exposed earlobes are common to other types of Christ, the woolly beard, parted below the chin and rising to cover the cavities below the cheekbones, further argues for the ultimate dependence of the Bulgarian wall painting upon the same model as our miniature. Whether this was the "miraculous image of the Saviour" reported by Ignatius of Smolensk in 1389³³ in a church of Christ the Saviour near the Golden Horn is, for the moment, less important than the evidently iconic nature of this model.

It is a well-understood phenomenon in Byzantine art that an image dependent upon a prototype may transform even the most salient features of that model. Grabar, for example, argued that the Bojana fresco was more faithful to the prototype than the seal of John Comnenus, noting that on the latter Christ is shown standing while he appears enthroned in the Bulgarian church.³⁴ He did not consider the possibility that these two versions of the Evergetês, separated by nearly a century and a half, could derive from different exemplars. Much newer in Byzantine studies is the realization that an epithet was often attached to an image which bears the features of an entirely different type.³⁵

³¹ I am indebted to Professor Stefan Bojadzhiev for figures 6 and 7.

³² Grabar, *Peinture religieuse*, 120–22, pl. ix. The nimbus is flanked by the inscription IC XC OEBEPTETHC.

³³ "Hoždenie Ignatija Smolnjanina," ed. S. V. Arsen'ev, *Pra-voslavnyj Palestinskij Sbornik*, 12 (1887), 10. Citing the translation by B. de Khitrowo, Grabar (*Peinture religieuse*, 121) gives the year as 1369. Ignatius' travels lasted from June 1389 to February 1392: see G. P. Majeska in *DOP*, 27 (1973), 72, note 5.

³⁴ Grabar, *Peinture religieuse*, 122.

³⁵ On this problem, see the studies by M. Tatić-Djurić, "La

Such is the case with the only work identified by inscription as an Evergetês. A large marble slab immured in the Metropolis at Serres (fig. 8)³⁶ carries such a legend but, as has been pointed out, the Lord here wears the features of a Pantokrator.³⁷ The relief has been assigned to both the twelfth century and the Palaiologan period.³⁸ But it is its utter lack of resemblance to the Christ of the Moscow leaf rather than chronological uncertainty that makes this example irrelevant to our pursuit of the prototype of the Moscow leaf.

Nonetheless, the Pantokrator type is germane in that it is frequently used as a headpiece to John's text in Gospel books and Lectionaries of the eleventh and twelfth centuries. For example, a bust of Christ occupies this situation in the "Codex Torontonensis," a Gospel book of approximately the same date as Dumbarton Oaks cod. 3.³⁹ Here, almost as a mirror-image of the Moscow leaf, the irises of Christ's eyes and his forelock are turned to his left, while his right hand points to the open book. Unlike our page, however, the Lord is inscribed within a roundel, thus minimizing the icon-like aspect of the image. Medallions with a bust of Christ are found even when the evangelist himself is pictured at the start of his Gospel⁴⁰ but neither then nor when the Lord alone occupies the miniature does he display the characteristics of the Evergetês. The only exception to this proposition known to me is a miniature in a Gospel book in Baltimore, W. 522,⁴¹ customarily ascribed to the twelfth century but

Vierge Immaculée Panachrantos. Son iconographie et son culte" in *De cultu mariano saeculis VI–XI* (Rome, 1972), II, 247–71; "Eleousa. A la recherche du type iconographique," *JÖB*, 25 (1976), 259–67; and, of particular concern to our present investigation, "Iz naše srednjekovne mariologie. Ikona Bogorodice Evergetide," *Zbornik za likovne umetnosti*, 6 (1970), 15–36.

³⁶ I am indebted to Dr. Haralambos Bakirtzis, ephor of Byzantine Antiquities at Kavala, for this photograph.

³⁷ K. Wessel, s.v. "Christusbild," *RBK*, I (Stuttgart, 1966), col. 1023.

³⁸ R. Lange, *Die byzantinische Relieffikone* (Recklinghausen, 1964) (12th century); A. Grabar, *Sculptures byzantines du moyen âge*, II (Paris, 1976), no. 162 (Palaiologan date), pl. cxli. Grabar suggests that there are other images at Serres that bear the epithet O EBEPTHTIC as on this slab. But neither his text nor the older literature to which he refers elaborate upon this point. I have been unable to verify the existence of such works.

³⁹ Thomas Fisher Rare Book Library, University of Toronto, cod. 3009, fol. 180r (*Illuminated Greek Manuscripts* [note 3 *supra*], no. 27, fig. 47, citing the book under its previous shelf-mark, cod. DeRicci 1). For a twelfth-century example, see Athens, Nat. Lib., cod. 93, fol. 143v (A. Marava-Chatzincolaou and C. Toufexi-Paschou, *Catalogue of the Illuminated Byzantine Manuscripts of the National Library of Greece*, I (Athens, 1978), no. 61, 230, fig. 649).

⁴⁰ Leningrad, Public Library cod. 98, fol. 179v (*Iskusstvo vizantii* [note 6 *supra*], II, no. 517).

⁴¹ On this manuscript, see Der Nersessian, "Psalter and New Testament," 179–80, and in *JÖB*, 21 (1972), 113.

which, for several reasons, must be associated with the Psalter and New Testament in Washington. In the headpiece to John (fig. 9) in this manuscript, but within a roundel rather than the panel format of our miniature, Christ raises two fingers above the level of the scroll that he holds in his left hand. The half-length format of this image allows us to read it as, in a sense, an enlarged version of the Christ on the Moscow leaf. This impression is all the stronger when it is realized that the Lord's eyes and forelock are here turned sharply to his right. Below, the initial E, inhabited by the gesturing Evangelist, further binds the Walters Art Gallery Gospel book to the Moscow leaf and to other ornament in our Psalter and New Testament, where, as Der Nersessian pointed out, such anthropomorphic decoration is common. But she failed to notice that the Cross page, formerly folio 4^v, in the Washington manuscript,^{41a} finds an almost exact (although unpublished) counterpart on folio 1^v of the book in Baltimore. Beyond these similarities, it must be noted that the combination of lobed upper corners and flower-petal ornament attached to the base of the miniatures in W. 522 finds frequent counterparts in Dumbarton Oaks cod. 3. Finally, one may observe that in the two manuscripts the text (though written by a different hand) employs the same light brown ink while the titles of both are in gold. I see no reason to separate the Baltimore Gospel book from the time of the Psalter and New Testament and would ascribe their illumination to the same atelier.

For our purposes it is the shared image of the Evergetês that is of importance. Like the Pantokrator, it was obviously considered appropriate to the headpiece of John, but the reasons why this should be are not easy to discern. Different from the Synoptics, all of which begin in the narrative mode, John's Gospel starts with the famous proclamation of the Logos without whom nothing would have been.⁴² It is also the Gospel in which God's gift of his only-begotten Son is emphasized. But since, as we have seen, instances of the Pantokrator type greatly outnumber images of Christ the Benefactor in this situation, there is no reason to suppose that the iconography of the Evergetês is the result of exegesis.

Indeed, far from any peculiar relationship to this

^{41a} Der Nersessian, "Psalter and New Testament," 156 and fig. 1.

⁴² John 1:3: πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο, καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδὲ ἓν. In various parts of the Christian East, the opening verses of this Gospel were used as incantations. See K. Preisendanz, *Papyri graecae magicae*, II (Leipzig and Berlin, 1928), nos. P 5b, P 5c, P 9, P 19 and, most recently, L. Nees in *CahArch*, 29 (1980–81), 141.

text, the type that Weitzmann identified as the Evergetês—even though it has passed out of the consciousness of modern iconographers⁴³—is found in a group of manuscripts, small in number but quite heterogeneous in character. The most celebrated example of which I am aware is in Sinai cod. gr. 204, a Lectionary of ca. 1000, whose frontispiece of Christ⁴⁴ has been neglected in favor of its better-known Evangelist portraits. Although this Christ is a full-length figure, as on the seal from the Schlumberger collection, the direction of his gaze and his forelock, and the *croix pattée* of his nimbus, link him with the bust on the Tretjakov page. This does not necessarily imply that the frontispiece depends directly upon a hypothetical image of the Evergetês. It does mean that such a combination of features was applied to the Lord in a manuscript of the highest quality at the start of the eleventh century and was therefore current some eighty years before Dumbarton Oaks cod. 3 was written and illuminated.

Approximately contemporary with our book, a Climacus manuscript in the Vatican displays a bust of Christ very similar to that on the Moscow leaf.⁴⁵ He is poised in an arc of heaven, surveying a scene in which the prophet David demonstrates Obedience and Pilgrimage to a group of monks. Although the Lord here is again identified only as IC XC, he possesses all the qualities that characterize the Evergetês and, in this case, shares the lack of a book or scroll with our miniature. That bustate icons of this type existed is suggested by repeated representations in the Theodore Psalter of 1066. The clearest example is to be found in a miniature attached to the Ode of Habakkuk but half-a-dozen other such panels decorate scenes in this Constantinopolitan manuscript.⁴⁶ These diminutive pic-

⁴³ Neither the term nor the type is mentioned by Ph. Kontoglous, *Ἐκφράσεις τῆς ὀρθοδόξου εἰκονογραφίας*, 2 vols. (Athens, 1960). For a detailed account of the variant positions of Christ's eyes, hands, etc., see vol. I, 99–106, and vol. II, pls. 3–13.

⁴⁴ N. P. Kondakov, *Ikongrafija Gospoda Boga i spas našego Iesusu Hrista* (St. Petersburg, 1905), fig. 57; V. N. Benešević, *Monumenta Sinaitica*, I (Leningrad, 1925), pl. 26. For a detail of Christ's head, K. Weitzmann, "Various Aspects of Byzantine Influence on the Latin Countries from the Sixth to the Twelfth Century," *DOP*, 20 (1966), 4, fig. 2.

⁴⁵ Vat. gr. 394, fol. 19^r. J. R. Martin, *The Illustration of the Heavenly Ladder of John Climacus* (Princeton, 1954), 58, 179, fig. 78, associates this manuscript on stylistic grounds with Vat. gr. 342, a Psalter the Easter tables of which begin in 1088.

⁴⁶ Habakkuk miniature: fol. 199^r (S. Der Nersessian, *L'illustration des psautiers grecs du moyen âge*, II: *Londres, Add.* 19.352 [Paris, 1970], fig. 313). See also the icons depicted on fols. 94^r, 145^v, 153^r, 172^r, 198^r, 196^v. In the mid-twelfth-century Madrid Skylitzes, fol. 115^v a (A. Grabar and M. Manoussacas, *L'illustration du manuscrit de Skylitzès de la Bibliothèque Nationale de Madrid*

tures of pictures exhibit neither the characteristics of the Evergetês, i.e., the invariable rightward direction of the Lord's gaze and his forelock, nor those variables, such as the book and the blessing, the inclusion of which depends on the level at which Christ's figure is truncated. These peculiarities, however, do appear in a few panels of the thirteenth century or later that constitute perhaps the best evidence for the earlier existence of icons of the Evergetês type.⁴⁷ Like the Sinai icon (fig. 4) to which Weitzmann applied this epithet, none are identified by inscription as Christ the Benefactor. On the few occasions that they have been discussed the icons have been labeled as Christ Pantokrator. It must be pointed out that they no more carry identification as the Pantokrator than they do as the Evergetês. Certainly the presence in these panels of the book held by Christ, opened to the text of John 8:12, is an insufficient criterion by which to designate the All-Ruler.⁴⁸ Again, given the fluid state of Late Byzantine iconography in which the attributes and designations of one type passed easily to quite another,⁴⁹ one may demand a conjunction of elements—for example, the attitude of the eyes and the head as a whole, together with the cut of the beard and the hair—of the sort encountered in the Moscow leaf before recognizing a particular type.

With the exception of the frontispiece of Sinai cod. gr. 204, all of the visual testimony that we have cited till now for the nature of the Evergetês type has been of later date than the Moscow leaf. The Christ of the Sinai Lectionary intimates that about

the year 1000 the Evergetês, even if it was not so designated, can be distinguished from the Pantokrator type by a set of specific physical characteristics. But can this be supported by other evidence of the first half of the eleventh century? It is into this time-span, even though the precise chronology remains a matter of dispute,⁵⁰ that the decoration of the katholikon of Hosios Loukas fits. And it is among these mosaics that at least three physiognomically distinct types of Christ occur. Invariably he is here identified only as IC XC. He appears both half-length and in bust form; sometimes the book is open and more often closed; but it is the features of the head, not the designation or attributes, that allow us to recognize at Hosios Loukas both the type of Christ in the headpiece to Psalm 77 and the type represented on the leaf from this book in the Tretjakov Gallery.

The well-known Christ in the lunette over the door in the east wall of the narthex⁵¹ blesses and gestures toward his open codex in a manner virtually identical to that used in the headpiece of folio 39^r (fig. 3). But since in the miniature the paint has flaked from much of Christ's hair and eyes, it would be rash to assume that the details of the head correspond to this mosaic at Hosios Loukas as closely as do the disposition of the right hand and book. Rather, the contrast between the two Christ types should be made in terms of other, less celebrated mosaics. In a spandrel above the east window of the apse, Christ's eyes stare down from beneath two strands of hair directed toward the left side of his forehead (fig. 10).⁵² The head is broad relative to its length and the irises of the eyes are set almost centrally in their sockets. It is such details, as well as the almost complete absence of formal modeling in the neck, that differentiate this figure from the Christ in a medallion in the south cross-arm of the church (fig. 11).⁵³ Here Christ's long head ter-

[Venice, 1979], fig. 142), a bust of Christ with the forelock of the Evergetês appears in a miniature illustrating the investigation by Leo VI of his brother's involvement in the conspiracy of Samonas. According to Skylitzes (ed. Thurn, p. 185, line 25, and p. 190, lines 68–79) this scene took place in the métatorion of Hagia Sophia. The chronicler says nothing of any icon.

⁴⁷ G. and M. Soteriou, *Εἰκόνες τῆς Μονῆς Σινᾶ* (Athens, 1958, no. 196); M. Chatzidakis, "L'évolution de l'icone au 11^e–13^e siècles et la transformation du templon," *Actes du XV^e Congrès International d'Etudes Byzantines, Athènes, Septembre 1976*, I (Athens, 1979), 360–61, pl. XLVIII, 24 (here ascribed to the 12th century; reproduced in color in J. Gale, *Sinai and the Monastery of St. Catherine* [New York, 1980], fig. 94, and captioned as second half of 15th century); Gale, *Sinai*, no. 95.

⁴⁸ The book may be held open or closed and, when open, inscribed with a variety of texts. For this diversity, see the catalogue of examples in Matthews, "Byzantine Use" (note 22 *supra*), 445–51.

⁴⁹ Note 35 *supra*. This fluidity characterizes images of Christ as well as those of the Virgin considered by Tatić-Djurić: cf. our remarks on the Serres relief (fig. 8) *supra*. To cite a further example, the celebrated mosaic icon in Berlin (V. H. Elbern, *Das Ikonkabinett der frühchristlich-byzantinischen Sammlung in der Skulpturengalerie Berlin* [Berlin, 1979], no. 1), which has all the characteristics normally recognized as those of a Pantokrator, is inscribed IC XC O EAEEMΩN.

⁵⁰ The literature on this problem is critically surveyed by C. Mango, "Les monuments de l'architecture du XI^e siècle et leur signification historique et sociale," *TM*, 6 (1976), 364–65.

⁵¹ E. Diez and O. Demus, *Byzantine Mosaics in Greece. Hosios Lucas and Daphni* (Cambridge, Mass., 1931), color pl. II, fig. 12.

⁵² Unpublished. A variant of this physiognomical type occurs within a medallion in the eastern section of the vault in the north crossarm of the church (Diez and Demus, color pl. II, fig. 18). I am grateful to Dr. Susan Young who obtained the photographs used in figs. 10 and 11 from the Benaki Museum archive and to the Museum for permission to reproduce them. Professor Irina Andreescu, who is preparing a survey of the decoration at Hosios Loukas, informs me that neither of these mosaics has been restored.

⁵³ Diez and Demus, fig. 18. Discussing this mosaic, Matthews, *Pantokrator* (note 22 *supra*), 90–91, notes the difference between the gesture of blessing used here—in which the ring finger only is bent to meet the thumb—and that of the Christ on fol. 39^r

minates in a beard divided in two directly above a flurry of modeling courses in the neck that is even more elaborate than the treatment of the same area in the Moscow leaf. Moreover, the upraised fingers of his right hand scarcely rise above the upper edge of the codex. But in contrast to the spandrel mosaic, and as if predicting the forms in our miniature, Christ's eyes and the double forelock of his hair are clearly directed toward his right. The difference between these two mosaics is akin to that between the two miniatures from Athos, Pantokrator cod. 49. In both cases, it is the second image, deliberately asymmetrical in the carriage of the head and the eyes, that gives a more forceful, even a more human, aspect to the Lord.

In many respects, then, the Christ in the south cross-arm of Hosios Loukas anticipates the Christ of the Moscow leaf. This is not a fortuitous resemblance between monumental and miniature painting for each of the features that we have identified—and in particular the disposition of the head, of the forelock, and of the eyes, as well as the linearity of the neck—recurs in a fresco in the naos of St. Neophytos at Paphos.⁵⁴ Christ's blessing here is made with only the fourth finger bent, as in the south cross-arm mosaic at Hosios Loukas. But no less telling is the fact that in the Cypriot wall painting, as in the fresco at Bojana (fig. 6) painted about seventy-five years later, the blessing hand is raised considerably above the level of the book. Indeed, in both paintings Christ rests the Gospel on his left thigh. At the very least this allows that our miniature, if it is in any way related to these images, is a truncated version representing little more than the upper third of an enthroned figure.

Having exhausted all the pictorial testimony, there remains a body of historical and textual evidence that must be brought to bear on the problem of whether the Evergetês was seated or standing. We have already referred to Grabar's preference, in light of the Bojana fresco, for an enthroned image. No corroboration for this view is to be found in the

(fig. 3) where both the middle and the ring finger touch the thumb. The contrast between the two mosaics that we reproduce is even stronger for in the spandrel image (fig. 10) both the ring finger and the little finger are bent and only two fingers remain extended.

⁵⁴C. Mango and E. J. W. Hawkins, "The Hermitage of St. Neophytos and its Wall Paintings," *DOP*, 20 (1966), 157, fig. 44. The fresco is on the north wall of the church (*ibid.*, fig. 14), aligned with the templon and thus analogous to the situation of the Christ Evergetês at Bojana. A. Epstein, *JBAA*, 84 (1981), p. 19, figs. 7 and 8, has suggested that the enthroned Christ at St. Neophytos belongs to the original phase (1183) of the decoration and is not to be associated, as proposed by Mango and Hawkins, with the enlargement of the naos in 1196.

typikon of the Evergetês monastery. Indeed this text contains no reference whatsoever to such an icon.⁵⁵ However, this is less of an embarrassment than it may seem. The typikon of the monastery of Christ Evergetês is a twelfth-century document relating to the refounding of this establishment by a certain John Comnenus. This event took place in all probability between 1104 and 1118.⁵⁶ For our purposes two important, if somewhat obvious, conclusions may be drawn from this fact. First, both the typikon and the monastery to which it refers post-date Dumbarton Oaks cod. 3 and the leaf in Moscow that was folio 187 bis in this manuscript. Second, if the page in the Tretjakov Gallery does reproduce an eponymous icon originally kept in the monastery of Christ Evergetês, it is unlikely that this image—be it fresco or panel—survived John Comnenus' undertaking. Two epigrams on the monastery, published by Lampros,⁵⁷ show that this protosebastos and megas doux built the church of the Evergetês from the ground up on the site of a house inherited from his father, the sebastocrator Isaac, and that he rebuilt the adjacent monastery of the same name. It was in this monastery, at an unknown date, that he died under the name of Ignatios. If either the church or some other building in the monastery contained an image of the Evergetês it more likely resembled the standing Christ depicted on his seal (fig. 5).

A poem by Manuel Philes⁵⁸ shows that the church was still well preserved in the first half of the fourteenth century, shortly, that is, before the visit of Ignatius of Smolensk.⁵⁹ Since Philes' lines describe an image of Christ who is said to "bless the assembly of monks" we can deduce that the church remained the nucleus of a monastery. But any supposition that the pictures described by the Greek poet and the Russian traveler were one and the same must be treated circumspectly.⁶⁰ Equal cau-

⁵⁵I am obliged for this information to Father Paul Gautier who is preparing a new edition and translation of the typikon. Until this appears, see A. Dmitrievskij, *Opisanie liturgiĭeskikh rukopisej chranajaščichsja v bibliotekach pravoslavnago vostoka*, I: *Typika* (Kiev, 1895), 256–650.

⁵⁶Note 29 *supra*.

⁵⁷Νέος Ἑλλ. 8 (1911), 19–21. The epigrams were reprinted by N. Beês, as evidence in a different argument, in *Repertorium für Kunstwissenschaft*, 39 (1916), 114–15.

⁵⁸*Carmina*, ed. E. Miller, II (Paris, 1857), no. XL, vv. 405–6.

⁵⁹Note 33 *supra*. Ca. 1420 the Russian pilgrim, Zosimus, mentions the relics of St. Theodosia preserved in the monastery of Christ Evergetês (ed. Ch. Loparev, *Pravoslavnyi Palestinskij Sbornik*, 24 [1899], 8).

⁶⁰Matthews, *Pantokrator* (note 22 *supra*) points out that since Christ is described by Philes as "leaning forward from on high" and is said to "silence the host of angels . . . to which art has given life," the poet must be referring to an image in the dome of the church.

tion is appropriate with regard to the earlier history of the church and the suggestion that it is to be identified with the mosque known as Gül Camii.⁶¹ The archaeological controversy *per se* has little bearing on the form of the Evergetês image, but H. Schäfer's demonstration that there were three stages in the building of the substructure of Gül Camii and that the present superstructure (to be dated on technical grounds to the end of the eleventh or beginning of the twelfth century)⁶² rests on the second phase of this foundation, materially corroborates the textual evidence for John Comnenus's rebuilding.

Schäfer errs in suggesting that we have no information on the monastery of Christ Evergetês before its reconstruction by the protosebastos: it was certainly extant before 1071, the date of the Synaxarion in Paris, B.N. cod. gr. 1617.⁶³ This text relates the story, preserved also in the Synaxarium Sirmondianum, of the iconodule martyr Theodosia, her spirited defense of the image of the Chalkê, the way she earned death by defying the iconoclast patriarch Anastasius (730–754), and the preservation of her relics at the monastery of Christ Evergetês.⁶⁴ Much of this is the stuff of myth and certainly no cogent argument for the existence of a monastery of Christ the Benefactor in the early eighth century. But the date of the Codex Sirmondianum remains a matter of dispute. Assigned by its editor to the eleventh century (on the reasonable grounds that it contains a memorial for Nicholas Chrysoberges, the patriarch of Constantinople who died in 995),⁶⁵ it is now believed to represent, at least in essence, an edition of the time of Leo VI (886–911).⁶⁶ Schäfer's observation that the construction of the earliest stage of Gül Camii is unlikely to antedate the early eleventh century is not inconsistent with the notion, tenable in light of the Codex Sirmondianum, of a late tenth- or early

eleventh-century foundation for the monastery of Christ Evergetês.

Such a date would coincide with the first appearance of the Evergetês type as we have recognized it in the Sinai Lectionary and, within a generation, among the mosaics of Hosios Loukas (fig. 11). It is possible that the diffusion of the type is to be related to the creation of the icon or, if this preceded the first foundation of the monastery, to the construction of a church in its honor. In this case, the painter of the Moscow leaf would, *ca.* 1084, merely be following a practice perhaps three-quarters of a century old.

Certainly no chronological objections stand in the way of the last, and most curious, migration of the Evergetês type. We have spoken of the visits of Slavic travelers to the Constantinopolitan monastery of the Benefactor⁶⁷ and the expression of this veneration at Bojana in 1259 (figs. 6, 7). One of the purest applications of the Evergetês type is to be found about a century earlier than the Bulgarian church, in the icon of the Saviour "not made by hand" which, like the leaf from our Psalter and New Testament, came to rest in the Tretjakov Gallery (fig. 12).⁶⁸ Although the precise place of manufacture of this side of the double-sided processional icon remains uncertain, its relationship to Byzantium generally⁶⁹ and to our miniature in particular is unmistakable. Peculiar among Russian icons is its almost square shape,^{69a} a feature shared with the Moscow leaf (fig. 1). Within this quadrilateral, the cross in the nimbus is broad and again flared at the ends. The ico-

⁶⁷ Note 33 *supra*.

⁶⁸ Inventory no. 14245, from the cathedral of the Dormition in the Moscow Kremlin. V. I. Antonova and N. E. Mneva, *Katalog drevnerusskoj živopisi*, I (Moscow, 1963), 66–67, no. 7, attribute the panel to Vladimir-Suzdal in the mid-twelfth century. V. N. Lazarev, *Novgorodian Icon-Painting* (Moscow, 1969), 10, pl. 8, argues more convincingly for an origin in Novgorod but dates it more broadly to 1130–1200. The other side of this icon, which measures 77 × 71 cm, shows the Adoration of the Cross.

⁶⁹ Lazarev, *loc. cit.*, and, most recently, H. Belting, *Das Bild und sein Publikum im Mittelalter* (Berlin, 1981), 180–82, fig. 69. One notes, too, the parallelism between the processional nature of this icon and the rite in which the tenth-century Constantinopolitan Mandylion was on special occasions taken from the diakonikon and carried ceremonially around the church before being placed on the altar for ecclesiastical veneration: E. von Dobschütz, *Christusbilder. Untersuchungen zur christliche Legende* (Leipzig, 1899), II, 110**–114**.

^{69a} Of the seven icons of the Holy Face listed by Lihačev, *Materialy* (note 8 *supra*), nos. 154, 162, 164, 380, 509, 510, 512, only one is square (no. 380) and this shows Christ looking toward his left. In his study of the evolution of this type in Russia, G. I. Vzdornov, "Ikona nerukotvornogo Obraza Spas. Pamjatnik Pskovskoj živopisi XV veka," *SovArh*, 3 (1973), 212–35, notes one 15th-century example in Smolensk (p. 215) which is square. But this icon has neither the forelock nor the irises of Christ's eyes turned to his right as in the Tretjakov icon.

⁶¹ H. Schäfer, *Die Gül Camii in Istanbul. Ein Beitrag zur mittelbyzantinischen Kirchenarchitektur Konstantinopels*, 1st Mitt., Beiheft 7 (Tübingen, 1973). This view has been challenged by T. F. Mathews, *The Byzantine Churches of Istanbul. A Photographic Survey* (University Park, Pa., 1976), 128, tentatively accepted by W. Müller-Wiener, *Bildlexikon zur Topographie Istanbuls* (Tübingen, 1977), 25, 140; and apparently vindicated by Aran in *JÖB*, 28 (note 29 *supra*), 223–28, through masonry analysis.

⁶² Schäfer, *Gül Camii*, 42–56, 77–81.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, 84. Cf. Aran (note 29 *supra*) 214.

⁶⁴ *Synaxarium CP*, cols. 828, lines 55–56; 830, lines 1–3.

⁶⁵ H. Delehaye, *AnalBoll*, 14 (1895), 417. Death of Nicholas Chrysoberges: *Synaxarium CP*, col. 314, lines 9–10.

⁶⁶ Thus F. X. Murphy, s.v. "Synaxary" in *New Catholic Encyclopedia*, XIII (New York, 1967), col. 881; F. Halkin, "Avant-Propos" to Delehaye, *Synaxaires byzantins, ménologes, typica* (London, 1977), i.

nography of the Holy Face called for the elimination of all but this aspect of the Lord;⁷⁰ thus we can compare only this area of the two works in the Tretjakov. From the omission of the neck derives a sense of greater rigidity in the icon, aided by the symmetrical distribution of the hair. But in the features that we have identified as critical, the resemblances are striking. In the icon Christ's forelock, even if it contains more strands of hair, is turned to his right as in our miniature. The irises of his eyes veer in the same direction over similarly heavy lower lids. The woolly beard is again divided in two at the tip and rises over the cheeks to join the sideburns. In this way (as also in most versions of the Pantokrator) only the lower portion of the ears is exposed. Other compelling similarities include the heavily shaded area where the beard starts below the lower lip and the strongly demarcated bone structure above the eyebrows.

These likenesses between two works widely separated in time and space are significant since they obviously transcend the realm of style: their manifestation in the Moscow icon seems to be an act of deliberate iconographic replication. Equally remarkable is the difference between the Saviour in the Tretjakov and the earliest known Byzantine Mandylion, painted probably about 945.⁷¹ This type of the "Macedonian Renaissance" was preserved in illuminations attached to the history of the Mandylion produced in the eleventh century and later.⁷² But where the image of the Holy Face became detached from its narrative context, as in wall painting, it lost its ties to the Macedonian type. This is not a process that occurred only centuries after the creation of the tenth-century Mandylion. At the same time as illuminators of eleventh-century menologia remained faithful to the prototype, monumental painters imposed a wealth of new

features on the Holy Face. In eleventh-century Cappadocia, for example, we find diverse physiognomies, some distantly related, other entirely distinct from the Constantinopolitan type.⁷³ Since these frescoes are in ruinous condition, it would be unwise to associate them with the Evergetês type. But by the end of the twelfth century at the latest, wall painters had appropriated the features of Christ the Benefactor for the image of the Saviour "not made by hand." In the church of the Saviour at Nereditsa near Novgorod, painted in 1199 and now destroyed, the hair of the Mandylion, while symmetrically disposed about the head as in the Tretjakov icon, hangs in two strands over Christ's forehead.⁷⁴ Both these locks and the irises of the eyes below are directed sharply toward Christ's right. As against this, at Nereditsa and elsewhere, the Keramion, the Holy Tile that was likewise considered an *acheiropoietos*, follows a different model.⁷⁵

If monumental images of the Mandylion in the

byzantin. *Les églises rupestres de Cappadoce*, I, ii [Paris, 1925], 399); a much damaged fresco in the south apse of Chapel 21 at Göreme (G. P. Schiemenz, "Zur Chronologie der kappadokischen Felsenmalerei," *AA*, 85 [1970], 258, fig. 1); on the north wall of the naos and on the central arcade at Saklı kilise (M. S. Ipsiroğlu and S. Eyuboğlu, *Saklı kilise. Une église rupestre de Cappadoce* [Istanbul, 1958], fig. 7; M. Restle, *Die byzantinische Wandmalerei in Kleinasien* [Recklinghausen, 1967], II, pl. 23). For the relative chronology of these programs of decoration, see A. W. Epstein, "Rock-Cut Chapels in Göreme Valley, Cappadocia: The Yılanlı Group and the Column Churches," *CahArch*, 24 (1975), 115–26. Epstein, p. 118, interprets both of the images at Saklı kilise as the Mandylion. It is more likely that one is the Mandylion and the other the Keramion, as at Nereditsa (note 75 *infra*) and Lagoudera in Cyprus.

Both Weitzmann, *The Icons* (note 71 *supra*), 97, and Grabar *Sainte Face* (note 70 *supra*), 35, observe the transformation of the Mandylion. Although he knew only one of the Cappadocian examples, Grabar tellingly suggests that, at the hands of later painters, the Holy Face conformed not to the original type of the Mandylion but to iconographic types of the Saviour of their own period.

It is not without interest that the miniature of the Holy Face in Florence, Laur., cod. Plut. XXV, 3, fol. 387^v (C. Bertelli, "Storia e vicende dell'immagine edissena di San Silvestro in Capite a Roma," *Paragone*, N.S., 37 [1968], 28, note 27, fig. 4) is almost a mirror-image of the Evergetês type. Painted by a Tuscan master between 1293 and 1300 (Belting, *Das Bild* [note 69 *supra*], 217, 305 no. 12), it shows Christ's double forelock and eyes directed sharply to his left. The date when the Image of Edessa was conveyed from Constantinople to the West is a matter of dispute. Bertelli, p. 22, suggests that it was a gift to the Genoese from John V Palaiologos in 1361. Averil Cameron, *The Septic and the Shroud*, inaugural lecture (London, 1980), 14, argues that shortly after 1239 Baldwin II sold the Mandylion, which she identifies with a "toella" kept in the chapel of the Pharos in the Great Palace, to St. Louis. Given the multiplicity of images suggested by the diverse types we have noted, it is possible that these views are not mutually exclusive.

⁷⁴ V. K. Mjasoedov, *Freski Spasa-Neredicy* (Leningrad, 1925), pl. XIX, 1. The Mandylion is painted on the western arch of the naos.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, pl. XIX, 2; Grabar, *Sainte Face*, 35, pl. III, 1.

⁷⁰ For this convention and the various ways in which it was observed and breached, see A. Grabar, *La Sainte Face de Laon. Le Mandylion dans l'art orthodoxe* (Prague, 1931).

⁷¹ K. Weitzmann, *The Monastery of Saint Catherine at Mount Sinai. The Icons, I: From the Sixth to the Tenth Century* (Princeton, 1976), 94–98, pls. xxxvi–xxxvii. However, the rightward cast of the head and the forelock evident in the Tretjakov icon are already suggested in the image of Christ held by Abgar (pl. xxxvii).

⁷² Thus in the menologia Alexandria, Greek Patriarchate Library, cod. 35, p. 286; Moscow, Historical Museum, cod. 382, fol. 192^v; and the Abgar Rotulus in New York, Morgan Library, cod. M499, pict. xiv (K. Weitzmann, "The Mandylion and Constantine Porphyrogenetos," *CahArch*, 11 [1960], 163–84, reprinted in his *Studies in Classical and Byzantine Manuscript Illumination*, ed. H. Kessler [Chicago, 1971], 224–46, figs. 214, 219–220, 222).

⁷³ E.g., at Karanlık kilise, in the north apse (unpublished; for a description, see G. de Jerphanion, *Une nouvelle province de l'art*

eleventh and twelfth centuries depart from the type created *ca.* 945, the notion that it represented Christ the Benefactor is firmly implanted in the literature of the tenth century. Dwelling on the contest between Chosroes, the Persian king, and the inhabitants of Edessa for possession of the Mandylion, the chronicler to whom we owe the account of its translation to Constantinople twice refers to the power of the icon to bestow benefits.⁷⁶ The idea of creating images of the “benefactor” has its roots in Hellenistic society when, for example, Demetrius of Phaleron (*ca.* 345–283 B.C.) was honored by the erection of 360 statues.⁷⁷ In Rome divinized emperors were similarly commemorated as εὐεργέται⁷⁸ and the term passed into Christian thought applied, as it was, to rulers on no less an occasion than the Last Supper (Luke 22:25). In Constantinople, the *augusti* were commonly acclaimed as εὐεργέται.⁷⁹ The Book of Ceremonies records that they were so addressed by the factions at Epiphany, Pentecost, and upon the promotion of a caesar and a patrikios.⁸⁰ Victorious charioteers were similarly hailed as “the choice of the benefactors.”⁸¹

A. Grabar proposed that the use of such “archaic” expressions was to give striking form to the idea of the mystical bond that connected Christ with the monarch.⁸² In the eleventh and early twelfth centuries Byzantine sovereigns and members of their families built churches to house their favorite icons and thus, if Grabar is correct, to associate themselves with the reputation of these images: the church of Christ Antiphonētēs built about 1042 by the Empress Zoe,⁸³ Anna Dalassena’s foundation of the monastery of Christ Pantepoptēs before 1087,⁸⁴ and the construction of the monastery of

Christ Philanthropos by Eirene Doukas, the wife of Alexios I,⁸⁵ all come to mind. But other icons were given shelter by less exalted beings. The monastery of the Virgin Evergetēs, which housed a famous image was, for example, founded in 1048/49⁸⁶ by a monk named Paul. And men below the rank of the basileus sought to arrogate to themselves the power or the protection of such icons. The Virgin Evergetēs, for instance, appears on two seals of a certain Constantine Melissenos; in the metrical inscription of one of these she is associated with the notion of an *acheiropoiētos*.⁸⁷ Unfortunately, we have no such body of documentation for the monastery of Christ Evergetēs as we do for the monastery of the Virgin that bore this epithet: in the second half of the eleventh century, this convent was a center of manuscript production.⁸⁸ In contrast, there exists no object that directly witnesses to an image of Christ Evergetēs before the early twelfth-century seal of John Comnenus, the second founder of the monastery (fig. 5).

Yet, as I have suggested, the visual evidence points to the existence of an image of this sort from the beginning of the eleventh century. Such a date is likely in terms of the textual evidence, and possible in terms of the archaeological evidence for the building that contained it. In this image Christ was probably shown seated, resting the Gospel on his left knee, and, as on the Tretjakov leaf, looking to the right with his right hand raised high in blessing. This icon (or fresco) seems to be reflected in the page from Athos, Pantokrator cod. 49, much as the icon of the Saviour, now in the same gallery (fig. 12), was copied a century later in the headpiece of a Novgorodian manuscript.⁸⁹ It is possible that its reproduction in the Psalter and New Testament reflects the devotion of some member of the late eleventh-century élite to the icon of Christ

⁷⁶Dobschütz, *Christusbilder* (note 69 *supra*), 71**, lines 5–7 and 21–22. I am grateful to Professor Alan Cameron for his elucidation of this text. When V. N. Benešević (*Monumenta Sinaitica* [note 14 *supra*], cols. 16–27, pl. 17) published the Evergetēs icon from Sinai (my fig. 4), he believed it to be a work of the eighth-ninth century and associated it with such *acheiropoiētai* as the Kamoulia and the Image of Edessa.

⁷⁷Strabo, IX, 398C; Pliny, *Hist. Nat.*, XXIV, 27. I draw these references from P. Veyne, *Le pain et le cirque. Sociologie historique d'un pluralisme politique* (Paris, 1976), whose study of what he calls “Evergétisme” is the fullest account of this phenomenon in the ancient world.

⁷⁸Veyne, 542.

⁷⁹A. Grabar, “L’art religieux et l’empire byzantin à l’époque des Macédoniens,” *Ecole Pratique des Hautes Etudes, Section des Sciences Religieuses, Annuaire* (1939–1940), reprinted in his *L’art de la fin de l’Antiquité et du Moyen-Âge*, I (Paris, 1968), 157.

⁸⁰*Constantin VII Porphyrogénète: Le Livre des Cérémonies*, ed. A. Vogt, I (Paris, 1938), 36, lines 13, 25–26; 56, line 19; 54, line 16; II (Paris 1939–40), 30, lines 18, 24, 31; 58, line 8.

⁸¹*Ibid.*, 121, line 13, 126, line 7: προβολή (τῶν) εὐεργετῶν.

⁸²Note 79 *supra*.

⁸³Janin, *Géographie ecclésiastique* (note 29 *supra*), 506.

⁸⁴*Ibid.*, 527.

⁸⁵*Ibid.*, 539.

⁸⁶H.-G. Beck, *Kirche und theologische Literatur im byzantinischen Reich*² (Munich, 1977), 214, 587, gives the date as 1048; in his recent edition of the typikon of this monastery (*REB*, 40 [1982], p. 6), Fr. Gautier indicates a date in June 1049.

⁸⁷Tatić-Djurić, “Ikona Bogorodice Evergetide” (note 35 *supra*), 16–17; I have been unable to identify further the owner of these seals.

⁸⁸J. Irigoin, “Paléographie et codicologie. La production d’un scriptorium de Constantinople peu après le milieu du XI^e siècle” in *Miscellanea codicologica F. Masai dicata MCMLXXXIX*, I (Publications de *Scriptorium*, no. 8 [Ghent, 1979]), 175–83. I am grateful to Dr. Michael McCormick for this reference.

⁸⁹The so-called Lobkovskij or Zakhar’evskij Prologue, Moscow, Historical Museum, cod. Khlud. 187, fol. 1^r (Lazarev, *Novgorodian Icon-Painting* [note 68 *supra*], 10). The fullest study of this manuscript of 1262 is G. I. Vzdornov, “Lobkovskij Prolog i drugie pamjatniki pis’mennosti i živopisi Velikogo Novgoroda,” *Drevnerusskoe iskusstvo* (Moscow, 1972), 255–69.

Evergetês: if this is so, then Dumbarton Oaks cod. 3 would merit its traditional designation as an "aristocratic" Psalter.

Be that as it may, we are still left with the problem why the Moscow leaf bears no inscription beyond the ubiquitous $\overline{\text{IC}} \overline{\text{XC}}$; indeed, why only late, provincial works like the Bojana fresco (figs. 6, 7) and the relief at Serres (fig. 8) are identified as the Christ Evergetês. Part of the answer lies in the interpenetration of iconographical types and the mobility of epithets. At times these were functional in nature, at others topographic.⁹⁰ The Evergetês was both. But our miniature should also be linked to a distinctive phenomenon in the later history of Byzantine art. Generally, it is not until the early fourteenth century that Constantinopolitan works—

⁹⁰See the studies cited in note 35 *supra* and, more recently, A. Grabar, "Remarques sur l'iconographie byzantine de la Vierge," *CahArch.*, 26 (1978), 169–78.

for example, mosaics at Fethiye and Kariye Camii—come to be inscribed with epithets of the icons whose features they have appropriated.⁹¹ But in outlying areas—as witness the Panachrantos at Monreale⁹² and the miniature icon of the Virgin Eleousa, so inscribed in an Oxford manuscript of 1225 written by Michael Papadopoulos, son of the priest George in the theme of Iannina⁹³—desire for and pride in association with celebrated Constantinopolitan images supplanted the epigraphic reticence characteristic of metropolitan works.

⁹¹On this phenomenon, see A. Cutler, "Art in Byzantine Society: Motive Forces of Byzantine Patronage," *JÖB*, 31 (1981), 769.

⁹²O. Demus, *The Mosaics of Norman Sicily* (London, 1949), 310, pl. 63.

⁹³Bodleian Lib., cod. Cromwell 11, p. 2a (I. Hutter, *Corpus der byzantinischen Miniaturhandschriften*, I, 1 [Stuttgart, 1977], no. 48, fig. 294).



3. Washington, D. C., Dumbarton Oaks, cod. 3, fol. 39r,
Headpiece to Psalm 77 (enlarged)



4. Sinai, Monastery of St. Catherine.
Icon of Christ Evergetès



5. Leningrad, Hermitage Museum.
Seal of John Comnenus, obverse



6. Bojana, Tomb-chapel. Christ Evergetès



7. Detail of Figure 6



8. Serres, Metropolis. Christ Evergetēs



9. Baltimore, Walters Art Gallery, cod. W. 522, fol. 231r, Head-piece to John



10. Hosios Loukas, Apse, Spandrel Mosaic, Christ



11. Hosios Loukas, South Cross-arm Mosaic, Christ



12. Moscow, Tretjakov Gallery. Mandylikon Icon